

## REMARKS

The objection to the drawing cannot be understood. "At least one spray head releasing by impact of heat" as recited in claim 1 is given reference character 4 in paragraph 0017 of the specification and shown in the drawing with reference to such character 4. The "spray head is arranged to spray mist" recited in claim 2 is also described in paragraph 0017 with reference to character 4 and shown in the drawing.

The objection to the Jepson or improvement formulation of the claims under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, cannot be understood, either. Attention is directed to 35 USC 1.75(e) and Supervisory Primary Examiner Scherbel.

The rejection of claims under 35 USC 102 or 103 for anticipation or obviousness from the cited Ohta, et al. patent is traversed on the mis-description in the Action of "flow transducer 58" of the patent in relation to the flow transducer of claim 1.

Column 4, line 12, of the Ohta, et al. patent describes "... pressure switch 58."

Column 5, line 8, of the Ohta, et al. patent confirms this description of its "... pressure switch 58 ...."

A pressure switch is not a flow transducer.

If there is a basis for considering a pressure switch a flow transducer, it is traversed. Pressure is singular and static. Flow is plural pressures, flow being from higher to lower pressures, together with other phenomena of motion. Therefore, the pressure switch cannot be the flow transducer claimed.

The pressure switch 58 of the Ohta, et al. patent does not provide a signal directly from any flow. After flow away from the pressure switch 58 has lowered the static pressure at the pressure switch 58 of the patent, the patented structure reacts. With the claimed


invention, reaction occurs earlier on the transduced flow motion that may eventually drop the static pressure to which the Ohta, et al. structure will then respond.

The different flow transducer structure claimed also provides a different functionality from the Ohta, et al. patent. Therefore, the patent neither anticipates nor makes obvious the claims.

If the rejection is still maintained, the Applicant submits that a person of ordinary skill in the art understands a flow transducer to be different from a pressure switch. A windmill is not a barometer. Therefore, the rejection must be based on the personal knowledge of an employee of the office, which entitles the Applicant to call for a support by affidavit under 37 CFR 1.104(d)(2).

Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, requested.

Respectfully submitted,



William R. Evans  
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP  
26 West 61<sup>st</sup> Street  
New York, New York 10023  
Reg. No. 25858  
Tel. No. (212) 708-1930